REMARKS

I. <u>INTRODUCTION</u>

Claims 1-44 are pending in the present application. By the current amendment, the specification, the drawings, and claims 3, 11, 21 and 34 have been amended. No new matter has been added by the current amendment, as support thereof can be found in the specification at, *inter alia*, page 5, line 12 through page 6, line 14; and originally filed claims 9, 19 and 32. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the subject patent application in view of the preceding amendment and for at least the following reasons.

II. OBJECTIONS TO THE DRAWINGS

The drawings have been objected to under 37 C.F.R. § 1.83(a) as allegedly not showing every feature of the invention specified in the claims. Applicants have herein submitted additional figures 3-5 showing representative embodiments of the OLED according to the present invention, and specifically showing the anode, hole transporting layers, electron transporting layers and cathode of such representative embodiments. No new matter has been added by these additional figures, as support thereof can be found in the specification at, *inter alia*, page 5, line 12 through page 6, line 14; and originally filed claims 9, 19 and 32.

Applicants have also amended the specification accordingly to reflect these additional figures 3-5. In view of these additional figures, Applicants respectfully submit that the objection to the drawings has been overcome and should therefore be withdrawn.

III. INFORMATION DISCLOSURE STATEMENT

The U.S. patent applications listed in the Information Disclosure Statement filed on June 24, 2002 have not been considered as the Examiner has indicated that copies thereof are not in the file. The Examiner has indicated that it is unclear whether these applications were filed but not scanned into the file, or if they were not filed. As indicated in the Information Disclosure Statement filed on June 24, 2002, copies of these applications were enclosed with the modified PTO form no. 1449. As the Examiner has requested copies of these patent applications for the file, Applicants have herein enclosed copies of such patent applications. Applicants respectfully request that these patent applications be expressly considered during the prosecution of the present patent application.

IV. CLAIM OBJECTIONS

Claims 3, 11, 21 and 34 have been objected to because of a typographical informality. Applicants have herein amended claims 3, 11, 21 and 34, as well as the specification, to correct this informality be replacing the term "30methylphenylphe

V. CLAIM REJECTIONS BASED ON BALDO ET AL.

Claims 1, 3, 7 and 8 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,097,147 (Baldo *et al.*). For at least the following reasons,

Applicants respectfully submit that these rejections should be withdrawn.

To anticipate a claim under 35 U.S.C. § 102, a reference must disclose each and every element of the claimed invention. *Verdergaal Bros. v. Union Oil Co. of Cal.*, 814 F.2d 628, 2 USPQ2d 1051 (Fed. Cir. 1987).

Baldo *et al.* is directed to a structure for high efficiency electroluminescent device. Baldo *et al.* discloses "[a] light emitting device including a pixel having a substantially transparent anode; a hole transporting layer over the anode; an emission layer over the hole transporting layer; a blocking layer over the emission layer; an electron transporting layer over the blocking layer; and a cathode in electrical contact with the electron transporting layer." Baldo *et al.*, abstract.

In contrast to the teachings of Baldo *et al.*, the organic light emitting device of the present invention, as currently recited in independent claim 1, includes a "hole transporting layer ... doped with a phosphorescent material," and an "electron transporting layer ... doped with the phosphorescent material." On the other hand, Baldo *et al.* discloses an undoped hole transporting layer and an undoped electron transporting layer. *See* Baldo *et al.*, column 6, lines 9-10, 13-14. Thus, it is respectfully submitted that Baldo *et al.* does not anticipate the claimed invention as it does not disclose each and every element of the invention as presently claimed in independent claim 1, as well as dependent claims 3, 7 and 8 therefrom. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of these claims under

35 U.S.C. § 102 be withdrawn.

VI. CLAIM REJECTIONS BASED ON AZIZ ET AL.

Claims 1-7, 9-11, 14-21, 24-34 and 37-44 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,614,175 (Aziz *et al.*), and claims 12-13, 22-23 and 35-36 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Aziz *et al.* For at least the following reasons, Applicants respectfully submit that these rejections should be withdrawn.

To anticipate a claim under 35 U.S.C. § 102, a reference must disclose each and every element of the claimed invention. *Verdergaal Bros. v. Union Oil Co. of Cal.*, 814 F.2d 628, 2 USPQ2d 1051 (Fed. Cir. 1987).

To render a claim obvious under 35 U.S.C. § 103, the prior art must teach or suggest all of the claim limitations. *In re Royka*, 490 F.2d 981, 180 U.S.P.Q. 580 (C.C.P.A. 1974). Moreover, obviousness can only be established by combining or modifying the teachings of the prior art to produce the claimed invention where there is some teaching, suggestion or motivation to do so. *In re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071, 5 U.S.P.Q.2d 1596 (Fed. Cir. 1988). This teaching or suggestion to make the modification must be found in the prior art and not in the Applicants' disclosure. *In re Vaeck*, 947 F.2d 488, 20 U.S.P.Q.2d 1438 (Fed. Cir. 1991).

Aziz et al. is directed to organic light emitting devices. Aziz et al. discloses "[a]n organic light emitting device which contains a mixed region of a hole transport, an electron transport, and an organic luminescent component.... Further, the device contains a hole transport region situated between the mixed region and an anode electrode, and an electron transport layer situated between the mixed region and a cathode electrode." Aziz et al., abstract. The device disclosed in Aziz et al. includes "a mixed region comprising a mixture of a hole transport material and an electron transport material, and wherein this mixed region comprises an organic luminescent material." Aziz et al., column 4, lines 17-20.

In contrast to the teachings of Aziz *et al.*, the organic light emitting device of the present invention, as currently recited in independent claims 1, 9, 19 and 32, includes a "hole transporting layer ... doped with a phosphorescent material" adjacent to an "electron transporting layer ... doped with the phosphorescent material." Aziz *et al.*, on the other hand, discloses a single mixed region of a hole transport material and an electron transport material, the mixture further including an organic luminescent material. Aziz *et al.* does not teach nor suggest the presently claimed organic light emitting device including two adjacent layers each doped with a phosphorescent material (*i.e.*, a "hole transporting layer ... doped with a phosphorescent material" adjacent to an "electron transporting layer ... doped with the phosphorescent material"). Thus, it is respectfully submitted that independent claims 1, 9, 19 and 32, as well as dependent claims therefrom, are not anticipated by, nor rendered obvious by Aziz *et al.*, and thus Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of these claims under 35 U.S.C. §§ 102 and 103 be withdrawn.

Application No. 10/087,417 Reply to Office Action of October 8, 2003

Page 27

VII. CONCLUSION

It is respectfully submitted that the claimed subject matter of the present application is patentable over the prior art and that all pending claims are in condition for allowance. Prompt reconsideration and allowance of the present application are therefore

earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted, KENYON & KENYON

Dated: January 8, 2004

Kevin T. Godlewski (Reg. No. 47,598)

One Broadway New York, NY 10004 212-425-7200 (telephone) 212-425-5288 (facsimile)

Attachments